



Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTY. DOCKET NO. |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 09/220,986 | 12/23/98 | SCHWARTZ | S 17649-20 |

EXAMINER

HM22/0510

CHARLES BERMAN
OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY
2029 CENTURY PARK EAST
38TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90067-3024

KISHORE, G
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1615

DATE MAILED: 05/10/01

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4-4-01

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 14-18 is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
☒ Claim(s) 14-18 is/are rejected.
☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.
☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

-SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES-

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

The request for the extension of time and the notice of appeal dated 2-15-01 and the filing under 1.53 (d) dated 4-4-01 are acknowledged.

Claims pending in this application are 14-18.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:**

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 2. Claims 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

‘non-oily’ recited again on line 4 of claim 14 is redundant since line 3 recites ‘non-oily base element’. Furthermore, it is unclear what this term represents in terms of specific compounds. Are they hydrophilic? If they are, it is natural for one to expect the salt to dissolve in the hydrophilic component (also in claim 18). ‘the mineral salt elements’ lacks antecedent basis.

‘the scrubbing agent’ in claim 16 lacks an antecedent basis in claim 14. The examiner suggests the terms either ‘is’ or ‘comprises’ in claims reciting ‘include’ or ‘including’.

Art Unit: :1615

Are the compounds recited in claim 17 in addition to the components in claim 14? If so, the examiner suggests 'further comprising'. What is meant by 'lipocol glycerin' as recited in this claim?

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Shanni (5,631,012).

Shanni discloses compositions containing a non-oily base material (water), emollients (note Example II).

5. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stavroff (US 5,866,145).

Art Unit: :1615

Stavroff discloses compositions containing dead sea salts, an emollient, a skin conditioner and fragrance (note the abstract, and columns 1-2).

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but still are not found to be persuasive. Applicant's only argument is that Stavroff is not prior art based on the declaration provided. This argument is not found to be persuasive for the following reasons. Instant claims are broader in scope than the compositions in the declaration with regard to a) the amounts of the dead sea salts; 2) the nature of the composition claimed in instant claims, i.e., instant claims are for exfoliation and containing pumice or silica. Furthermore, instant claims are drawn to minimum amounts of water which will not solubilize the salt granules. The declaration appear to indicate 53 to 64% of water is used while the salt used is only 5 %. The reference clearly indicates the use of 66.66 %. Furthermore, the declaration shows the use of Masada salt. The reference teaches Dead sea salt. The differences are unclear. Therefore, the reference is deemed to be still prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: :1615

7. Claims 14-15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 1479 199 in view of JP 08113530, Biener (4943432) by themselves or in combination.

GB discloses compositions containing salt crystals, propylene glycol and emollient for the skin treatment (note the entire patent, Example 3 and claims in particular). GB however, does not teach that the salt crystals are those obtained from Dead Sea.

JP teaches that the salt obtained from Dead Sea salt has excellent skin beautifying actions (note the abstract).

Biener similarly teaches that Dead Sea salt and a salt mixtures which is an excellent therapeutic agent for skin diseases (note col. 1, line 27 et seq.).

The use of the salt obtained from Dead Sea in the salt compositions taught by GB would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because of the excellent skin beautifying effects and the therapeutic effect taught by JP and Biener.

8. Claims 14-15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavroff cited above, further in view of Steward (5,922,313).

Stavroff does not teach instant additives in the skin treatment compositions.

Steward teaches that the addition of additives such as propylene glycol, aloe and lipomulse are common practice in the art (note the abstract, column 4 and examples).

The inclusion of components such as emollients and others not taught by Stavroff would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since these are commonly used

Art Unit: :1615

components in skin care preparations as taught by Steward and one would expect the best possible results by adding these components.

9. Claims 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavroff in view of Steward (5,922,313) as set forth above, in further combination with Chodosh (5,827,870).

Stavroff and Steward do not teach the addition of pumice in the compositions.

The reference of Chodosh which discloses an antimicrobial composition teaches that the addition of pumice in body scrubs is a routine practice in the art (note col. 5, lines 62-65). The addition of other scrubbing agents expecting the additional exfoliating effect would have been therefore, obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not found to be persuasive. Applicant's arguments again pertain to Stavroff as the prior art. These have been addressed above.

10. Claims 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 1479 199 in view of JP 08113530, Biener (4943432) by themselves or in combination, further in combination with Chodosh (5,827,870).

GB, JP and Biener do not teach the use of pumice or silica.

The reference of Chodosh which discloses an antimicrobial composition teaches that the addition of pumice in body scrubs is a routine practice in the art (note col. 5, lines 62-65). The addition of other scrubbing agents expecting the additional

Art Unit: :1615

exfoliating effect would have been therefore, obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, with the expectation of obtaining the best possible results.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *G.S. Kishore* whose telephone number is (703) 308-2440.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, T.K. Page, can be reached on (703)308-2927. The fax phone number for this Group is (703)305-3592.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [thurman.page@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Art Unit: :1615

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1235.



Gollamudi S. Kishore, Ph. D

Primary Examiner

Group 1600

gsk

April 26, 2001